



0000164134

ORIGINAL

David & Ruth Vargas
1410 E. Madison Rd. / PO Box 4803
Huachuca City, Arizona 85616

September 10, 2015

Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W Washington Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 8500-2996

RE: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Co-op's, (SSVEC), request for increased charges and rate changes

Dear Sirs,

SSVEC will or has applied to your commission to revise thier billing policy. They plan to raise thier monthly minimum fee from \$10.25 to \$50.00 for all customers who have added solar panels, wind generators or other systems to thier homes. there are several reasons for customers to sped the money to do this. One is to lower monthly utility costs. Another is to use clean energy as much as possible. SSVEC encouraged customers to do this and now we will be facing a \$50.00 monthly fee for doing the right thing! We are providing clean energy for ourselves and for SSVEC. They can not be allowed to penalize people who spent time and money to aid the cause for clean energy.

SSVEC encouraged this change! My husband and I spent our money to replace old windows, add insulation and replace an old heating and cooling system on the advice of SSVEC. They offered loan information and incentives for us to put in solar panels. Now it seems that they are seeing the financial results of customers following thier advice and they are looking for ways to augment thier income. It is unreasonable for SSVEC to penalize customers just because they followed SSVEC,s advise!!!

SSVEC agreed and approved our solar panel system, They inspected approved and even reimbursed a small amount of our \$6,000.00 plus cost. Now we will be fined for following thier advice. In addition to the money we spent to put in our solar system we will be fined for using it,

HELP!!!!

Sincerely,

Ruth Vargas

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Nyles Courtney <ncourt@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 1:38 PM
To: BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web
Cc: Tom Kennedy
Subject: SSVEC rate proposal

A little less than a year ago, SSVEC representatives met with some of us "Solar Customers", to discuss a probable rate increase, since according to them we were not paying our fair share to cover infrastructure costs. At that meeting they suggested a 5- 10 dollar increase per month. Five dollars for those who already had solar installed, and, 10 dollars for any new solar customers. These representatives said they were going to bring this proposal to the ACC. They didn't.

Initially SSVEC encouraged all of us to invest in rooftop solar, endorsed net metering, and even provided a rebate. Now , the same people claim they are losing money and it's all the roof top solar customer's fault. SSVEC has recently come up with a 78 dollar per customer requirement to balance their books. I would respectfully request the ACC have an independent audit performed on SSVEC in order to verify their numbers. If their numbers are accurate then I suggest the ACC consider "minimum billing" to make it fair for all customers, including those who only live in the area part-time.

SSVEC proposes to break their word to all of us after they made good on their alternative energy quota. A class warfare approach, pitting all customers against the 2% solar customers is very lowhanded. Making us the "bad guys" after we collectively invested at least 12 million dollars of our own money at their behest , then proposing a whole "new deal" doesn't reflect integrity in their management.

I strongly urge you to reject their proposal, which if passed, will just about kill the roof top solar business in this area.

Thank you
Nyles Courtney
2654 Meadowbrook Circle
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Dennie Gilbert <dennieg@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 1:32 PM
Subject: Recent SSVEC solar proposal

Dear Commissioner,

I am deeply troubled by the recent SSVEC rate proposal in which my base rate will go from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over a 4 year period. I am a solar user and I feel that this is discrimination at its worst because non solar rates only go to \$25.00 per month.

I could go into great detail on why this is unfair but the one overriding fact which trumps all the rest, and that is that they are **reneging on a contract** with people who installed solar in good faith in past years.

Please reject this recent SSVEC proposal. This financial program based on 2% of their customers is totally unjustified.

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Jerry Harder <jdharder@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 11:57 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Cc: edefiji@aol.com; twkennedy@cox.net
Subject: SSVEC Proposed Rate Increase

September 16, 2015

To Commissioner Bitter Smith and the ACC Members,

I was highly disappointed at the tone of the recent Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative (SSVEC) letter toward solar users. I understand that they may not be happy about a \$1 million loss of revenue because of customers going to solar. But, they certainly know that solar is a trend and the right decision for our environment. SSVEC needs to make appropriate changes in their business model without penalizing solar users.

I want to strongly object to the recent rate increases proposed by SSVEC for solar users. I fully understand the necessity of maintaining the electric infrastructure, however the maintenance costs should be the same for a solar or traditional user and built into the basic fixed monthly fee. It is completely unfair for SSVEC to charge solar users double the monthly fixed electric fee (\$50 vs \$25).

I read recently of the long range plans of SSVEC to modernize plants and actually build their own solar farm(s) for electricity generation. I applaud their efforts to become solar users themselves. BUT they are not building these new or upgraded facilities for the benefit of their current solar customers. Do we get a credit for saving SSVEC large capital expenses for these initiatives?

I would hope that SSVEC would recognize their capital expense savings due to their solar users. Instead they have proposed penalizing solar users with double the fixed monthly fees. For example, if SSVEC has 53,000 customers, 1,300 solar users represent 2.5% of their customer base. AND their solar users greatly reduce, if not eliminate, 2.5% of the future cost of production expansion or modernization. If SSVEC spends \$50 million for these costs, they save \$1,250,000 because there is no need to plan any capacity expansion and/or modernization for their solar users.

I was previously a solar user for almost three years in California and I never received this kind of treatment from my electric company. I would hope that SSVEC would be developing business plans that encourage solar usage and not create pricing that discourages solar use.

Please reject this proposed SSVEC rate increase due to the unfair treatment of current solar users and the potential impact of reducing future solar customers.

Sincerely,

Jerry Harder

2996 Softwind Dr

Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

619-921-4687

jdharder@msn.com

Teresa Tenbrink

From: David Parsons <umpy@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 10:21 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web; Forese-Web
Subject: Fwd: Recent SSVEC rate proposal

I am forwarding this email sent to you by Tom Kennedy as I support all his comments and wish to add my concerns about this proposed rate increase. As noted, we were greatly encouraged by both SVECC and the federal government to install solar on our rooftops. Now, they wish to gouge us for using them. It is just not right, period!!

From: twkennedy@cox.net
To: bittersmith-web@azcc.gov, rburns-web@azcc.gov, stump-web@azcc.gov, Little-web@azcc.gov, Forese-web@azcc.gov
Sent: 9/16/2015 3:59:39 P.M. US Mountain Standard Time
Subj: Recent SSVEC rate proposal

Dear Commissioners,

I am deeply troubled by the recent SSVEC rate proposal in which my base rate will go from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over a 4 year period. I am a solar user and I feel that this is discrimination at its worst because non solar rates only go to \$25.00 per month.

I could go into great detail on why this is unfair but the one overriding fact which trumps all the rest, and that is that they are reneging on a contract with people who installed solar in good faith in past years.

Please reject this recent SSVEC proposal.

Very truly yours,

Tom Kennedy
Sierra Vista, AZ
520-803-8383

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Thomas Kroger <azkroger@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 9:23 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Cc: Tom Kennedy
Subject: Rate Hike for SSVEC in Sierra Vista

I am writing to ask that you hold SSVEC to its previous position of encouraging patrons to purchase solar generating equipment as part of a larger commitment to conservation. It was presented as a mutually beneficial commitment. I made that commitment and now SSVEC is not only abandoning its position but attacking me for taking advantage of the other patrons that do not have solar. Further, they are taking the opportunity to punish those who whether they have solar or not but use little electricity will be punitively billed by raising the minimum while lowering the cost per kwh. My family encompasses both examples, I have a well and a pool and use more electricity so I invested in solar to use less natural resources while my son is very conservative and uses very little electricity, both of us are going to be punished for our conservation. Is SSVEC not making enough money to continue their operation? Are the changes that the federal government is mandating going to threaten their stability without an increase? If not, tell SSVEC to leave alone those that have installed solar, accept the fact that they made a mistake causing patrons to make large investments, make what changes they feel necessary for new solar customers and to not raise the minimum charge for the conservative non solar patrons.

Please give this matter a complete and thorough evaluation.

Thomas E Kroger

Teresa Tenbrink

From: jls@cis-broadband.com
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 8:43 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web
Subject: Recent SSVEC Rate Proposal

Dear Commissioners,

I am deeply troubled by the recent SSVEC rate proposal in which my base rate will go from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over a 4 year period. I am a solar user and I feel that this is gross discrimination because non-solar residential rates only go to \$25.00 per month.

SSVEC advises anyone considering adding solar to consider the proposed rate structure before deciding to add solar. Five years ago I did study and accept the SSVEC proposal for home solar. The implicit contract made with SSVEC is now being unilaterally broken by the SSVEC proposal which grandfathers some rates for a period less than the warranted life of my system and includes the discriminatory base rate changes. No good faith decision can be made if such unilateral changes are allowed to stand.

Please reject this recent SSVEC proposal.

Very truly yours,

John Severn
Tucson, AZ
520-220-1997

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Ray Bersano <r.bersano@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2015 7:13 PM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: SSVEC PROPOSED RATE HIKE

Dear Commissioner Bitter Smith

I strongly urge you to reject the Sulfur Springs proposal to dramatically raise electric rates on Solar users ! Solar energy has been strongly encouraged by the Federal government and SSVEC in the past. Now solar users are being portrayed as not paying their share. This is unfair and not in the best interest of our state or country. Not only will this irreparably hurt the solar industry but also dramatically slow new home owners from installing solar panels.

Please vote NO to the SSVEC Proposal , it is the right thing to do !

Thank you

Raymond & Martha Bersano

520 227 3278

Sent from my iPhone

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Donald Storm <dndbears2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2015 6:11 PM
To: BitterSmith-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web
Subject: SSVEC proposal

Dear Commissioners,

I am deeply troubled by the recent SSVEC rate proposal in which my base rate will go from \$10.25 per month to \$50.00 per month over a 4 year period. As a solar user I feel that this is discrimination at its worst. Non solar rates only go to \$25.00 per month, but even that is not justified. . This increase will ultimately hurt the lower wage scale households the hardest.

We solar system owners entered a contractual agreement with SSVEC before we installed our systems. SSVEC set the rules, enticed us to invest, and is now breaching the contract. Their actions are not in good faith.

Please reject this recent SSVEC proposal.

Don & Dolores Storm
Sierra Vista, AZ
920-378-3586

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Timothy Doyle <tedoyle@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2015 2:29 PM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Cc: Pat Call; Mayor, City of Sierra Vista, AZ
Subject: SSVEC petition for higher rates

To: Arizona Corporation Commission

From: Timothy Doyle

2310 E. Suma Dr

Sierra Vista, AZ

Sirs:

I am writing you to ask you to turn down the petition of Sulfur Valley Electric Cooperative to raise rates. Especially the way they want to raise the rates.

The reasons are as follows:

1. Raising the base rates hits the small homeowner the hardest as it will raise the bill no matter what they do to have electricity and SSVEC wants to raise it 150%. The small homeowners raise will be 25% of most bills. Whereas it will only be a 5 to 15% on the larger home owners and this raise is permanent. How fair is that to all members? Raising the electric rate is fair to all but the base rate is grossly unfair to the members who can least afford a rate raise.
2. By going to a \$50 base on only the homes with solar or wind is not only unfair to those that have installed these systems in the past but, very unnerving as Arizona is supposed to be one of the states favorable to solar and wind power. Those with solar or wind contribute back to the system by providing lower cost electricity to their member neighbors. They also spent a considerable amount to install those systems under the understanding that they would recoup the costs in savings. This much of a raise means that many will not recoup costs ever! Solar would now be a negative for anyone selling their home! Not only that but, most of the systems installed are not net zero so they are "just another smaller house on the grid". Why is SSVEC not putting a \$50 raise on those small homeowners too? Also you must remember that only 3% of the members are Solar or wind.
3. By letting what SSVEC wants to charge members after April 2015 if they installed solar, the rates that they want will stop all but off the grid individual solar installations in our service area. So much for Arizona being solar friendly. What about the members that are being trapped who thought they were getting a different deal? Why does this have to go back to April 2015?
4. Members were not notified in a timely manner about this raise. SSVEC just sent out letters to its members about this petition in early September and it looks as if this has been in the works for many months. Going back to April?

I hope you will take in these reasons to vote no on the SSVEC petition. As I understand it your commission is here to protect the citizens of this state from rates that are unjustified. Well I for one think these rates fit that description.

Thank you for your time,

Timothy Doyle

SSVEC member

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Nyles Courtney <ncourt@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2015 9:30 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: FW: voting records

From: Nyles Courtney [<mailto:ncourt@cox.net>]
Sent: Saturday, September 12, 2015 12:33 PM
To: Bitter-Smith-web@azcc.gov
Subject: voting records

Dear Chairperson Bitter-Smith;

I have emailed you a few times concerning ssvec solar rate proposals and appreciate you taking the time to look at them. I would really appreciate any info on the past years voting records of commissioners regarding "Sola Rate" and net metering issues. I have scoured your web site, and have been unable to find that info. Could you aim me in the right direction or send me some info.

Thanks

Nyles Courtney

ncourt@cox.net

2654 Meadowbrook Circle
Terra Vista, AZ 85650

Teresa Tenbrink

From: William Guinn <williamguinn@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2015 4:11 PM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Cc: Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: SSVEC rate hike -- Something Is Not Right

Chairman Bitter Smith,

SSVEC is proposing to raise rates again, this time by 3.17%. That makes about a 17% kwh rate increase over a 9-year period. Contrast SSVEC's 17% energy rate increase to the price of oil over the past several years. The price of oil is currently at a 7 year low according to the Federal government energy czars - less than half the price it sold for just a few years ago. Yet SSVEC's kwh prices are increasing by 17% over a similar timeframe? Something is not adding up in the SSVEC energy world.

Something else is not adding up. SSVEC is trying to shift the focus off of their 17% kwh rate increases – by blaming increases on residential solar owners. SSVEC says charging residential solar users for the electricity they use is somehow unfair. According to SVEC, it is especially unfair to those who do not have solar. So to make things right for us all, SSVEC proposes increasing solar owner's basic bill by more than 400% from \$10.25 to \$50. SSVEC is hoping this shaming of solar users will divert attention from SSVEC's proposed 250% increase to the non-solar basic rate. On top of the 17% kwh rate increase. Are they kidding?

If the water company follows SSVEC's logic it would look like this. Joe reads the news and decides to reduce his water usage. Joe removes his water thirsty plants and irrigation, replacing them with desert hardy plants. Joe buys and installs low water toilets, showers, appliances, etc... As a finishing touch, Joe buys a cistern that he installs on his roof to collect rainwater for later usage. Joe's water usage and bill goes down a lot. Following SSVEC's lead, does the water company now blame Joe for not paying his fair share of the water companies costs?

Something is not right here. What if I buy and replace my HVAC and appliances with more energy efficient models? Replace my windows and insulation with more energy efficient applications? Start turning off unused lights, raise my thermostat temperature in the summer – and my energy usage goes down substantially. Am I now not paying my fair share to SSVEC? Do I need a basic rate increase so as not to interrupt the revenue stream SSVEC has grown comfortable with?

Something else is not right. While energy costs are decreasing worldwide, government protected monopolies like SSVEC are raising their prices – and asking for more. SSVEC has double-digit rate increases over the same timeframe as we see record decrease in other related energy sectors. If there is any effort by SSVEC management to become more efficient, it is not evident in their past 9 year history of rate increases. It appears SSVEC management hopes that by demonizing and penalizing solar customers – non-solar customers may think they are getting off lucky with only a 250% increase to their basic rate.

Being a government protected utility monopoly should not be a license to demonize citizens – especially when they pay the same kwh rates as everyone else who uses electricity. If SSVEC gets away with this, what is their next move? Demonizing snowbirds for not paying their fair share - because they're gone half a year? Will SSVEC want to increase snowbirds basic rates by 400%? A move like that might hurt Arizona's economy, but SSVEC is already trying to do exactly that to our local residential solar installers and maintainers.

I urge the ACC to reject all of SSVEC's ridiculous rate increase requests – like local voters did overwhelmingly just a few years ago. Before granting any rate increases, let SSVEC first demonstrate they are being more efficient.

Let's keep rates low and keep paying for what we use – not for what we don't use. As the ACC, you are our elected representatives, we're counting on you.

Best Regards,

Bill Guinn

Sierra Vista

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Inge & Steve Scheumann <sscheumann@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 5:18 PM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: SSVEC Proposed Rate Increase - SSVEC Member Concerns

Dear Commissioner Bitter-Smith,

This is a letter to the ACC regarding the various proposals from SSVEC (and for that matter all Arizona power companies). I am concerned about the way the electric power companies continue to single out the rooftop solar households as the reason for raising the power rates well above what would be a normal increase. I am a SSVEC member and in the SSVEC community there are approximately 1,300 rooftop installations out of approximately 53,000 SSVEC customers. My SSVEC member friends with solar power and myself do not believe that such a small number of installations can account for the large increases SSVEC is proposing. A fellow rooftop solar friend had a discussion with an SSVEC manager and here is what he learned (This is from an E mail several of us received concerning the SSVEC proposal.):

"Since I last wrote, I received and read SSVEC's letter and I also met with one of the ranking managers from SSVEC this morning. I had planned to prepare a spreadsheet with lots of numbers, but I decided that it would be better to simply explain SSVEC's proposal as it affects us solar users in the near term. All the other data is superfluous for our purposes. So here goes, as I understand it.

1. Our basic monthly service charge will rise from \$10.25 to \$50.00 over a 4 year period starting in early 2017.

2. The following items will be grand fathered for 20 years following the installation date:

a. Avoided cost will equal retail cost no matter what the numbers actually are.

b. Users who produce excess yearly energy will be paid wholesale cost at true-up time.

I did not try to address what happens after the grand fathering period because it gets kind of gray and there are different options to consider based on the amount of energy you produce.

If the group wants to convene a meeting at Winterhaven Rec Center 2 like we did before, let me know what afternoon would be best and I will schedule it. If you have any questions, e-mail me and I will try to answer them."

The meeting is now scheduled for next week. Although other residential customers will see their monthly service charge increase to \$25, why should 1,300 homes with installed rooftop solar be charged twice as much? Also, those of us that installed rooftop solar were told that the buyback might be reduced, but we were never told that SSVEC would try to lower it to 1 to 3 cents/KWH or less. We were also told we were doing a good thing and now several years later we are the bad guys? We laid out the capital investment to install rooftop solar under the guidelines that would insure we would produce a certain percentage of our needs with any excess banked for either future use or a credit on our bill at the designated "True Up" date. All of this "information" indicated the installation was the correct choice if we planned to remain in our home for 7 to 10 years. It also added value to our home if and when we decided to sell. Now that "added value" is questionable.

I am concerned by the SSVEC "spin" that the rooftop people are the cause of the proposed increases to base electric rates. They are saying that out of approximately 53,000 customers 1,300 rooftops are responsible for this huge proposed increase. I don't think so.

Am also concerned that I signed a solar power contract with SSVEC, which they now are changing. To me, SSVEC should be bound by the written and implied contract it had with its solar power users. This means SSVEC can propose reasonable, transparent changes after the contract's time frame expires, but not before – we should be grandfathered. How can a SSVEC member trust anything SSVEC says in the future?

In addition, several non-roof top solar friends are upset about the increase because they elected not to install solar because they do an excellent job conserving energy. Their feeling is that with such a large increase conserving will make no difference. Again, SSVEC is sending the wrong message.

Finally, I have read that you are one of the ACC member's that has been investigating "dark money" charges and have proposed a way solution. I appreciate your efforts, because we AZ citizens do not have the funds to compete with the big guys.

The rooftop solar residents in the Sierra Vista area are asking for your help in protecting us against what we feel is an unfair rate increase and SSVEC's attack on the rooftop homes to justify their proposed rate changes.

Sincerely,
Steven Scheumann

Teresa Tenbrink

From: EDEFIJI@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 2:57 PM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: SSVEC Proposed rate increase

Dear Commissioner Bitter Smith,

This is my second letter to the ACC regarding the various proposals from SSVEC (and for that matter all Arizona Power Companies) concerning the way the Electric Power Companies continue to single out the rooftop solar households as the reason for raising the power rates well above what would be a normal increase. In the SSVEC Community there are approximately 1,300 rooftop installations out of approximately 53,000 SSVEC customers. We do not believe that such a small number of installations can account for the massive increases SSVEC is proposing. A fellow rooftop solar friend had a discussion with an SSVEC manager and here is what he learned. (This is from an E mail several of us received concerning the SSVEC proposal.)

"Since I last wrote, I received and read SSVEC's letter and I also met with one of the ranking managers from SSVEC this morning. I had planned to prepare a spreadsheet with lots of numbers, but I decided that it would be better to simply explain SSVEC's proposal as it affects us solar users in the near term. All the other data is superfluous for our purposes. So here goes, as I understand it.

1. Our basic monthly service charge will rise from \$10.25 to \$50.00 over a 4 year period starting in early 2017.

2. The following items will be grand fathered for 20 years following the installation date:

a. Avoided cost will equal retail cost no matter what the numbers actually are.

b. Users who produce excess yearly energy will be paid wholesale cost at true-up time.

I did not try to address what happens after the grand fathering period because it gets kind of gray and there are different options to consider based on the amount of energy you produce.

If the group wants to convene a meeting at Winterhaven Rec Center 2 like we did before, let me know what afternoon would be best and I will schedule it. If you have any questions, e-mail me and I will try to answer them."

We are currently working on a meeting date but I can assure you it will be soon. A 500% increase to cover/penalize the customer base because 1,300 homes installed rooftop solar?? Outrageous! Also, those of us that installed rooftop solar were told that buy back might be reduced but we were never told that SSVEC would try to lower it to 1 to 3 cents/KWH or less! We were also told we were doing a good thing and now several years later we are the bad guys? We laid out the capital investment to install rooftop solar under the guidelines that would insure we would produce a certain percentage of our needs with any excess banked for either future use or a credit on our bill at the designated "True Up" date. All of this "information" indicated the installation was the correct choice if we planned to remain in our home for 7 to 10 years. It also added value to our home if and when we decided to sell. Now that "added value" is questionable.

What is more of a concern is the "spin" by SSVEC that the rooftop people are the cause of the proposed increases to base electric rates. They are saying that out of approximately 53,000 customers 1,300 rooftops are responsible for this huge proposed increase. We don't think so.

We understand that one of the two coal fired plants in the Sulfur Springs Valley has been mandated by the EPA to be replaced by a gas fired plant at a reported cost of \$32 million! And, that new plant will only produce approximately 75% of what the current coal fired plant is producing. In addition there are plans to build a large Solar Field in the same area. These major expenses are more responsible for the proposed rate increases and not the 1,300 rooftop customers! So why is SSVEC trying to make the rooftop folks out to be the bad guys? They need to be honest about the rate increase.

Several non roof top friends are upset about the increase because they elected not to install solar because they do an excellent job conserving energy. Their feeling is that with such a large increase conserving will make no difference. Again, SSVEC is sending the wrong message.

Now, in addition to the current move to change the playing field, we read that several members of the ACC may have received large sums of "dark money" prior to the last election allegedly from various Arizona power companies so the donors could "stack the deck" when increases are requested. I know you are one of the ACC member's that has been investigating this charge and we "little guys" appreciate that because we do not have the funds to compete with the big guys.

If there was another company we could switch to for power, we would do it, but we are a captive audience and are at the mercy of any ACC ruling on the SSVEC rate increase.

The rooftop solar residents in the Sierra Vista area are asking for your help in protecting us against what we feel is an unfair rate increase and SSVEC's attack on the rooftop homes in order to cover up the true reason behind the proposed rate changes. As mentioned above, we are also concerned about the possibility of "dark money" that is

tainting the reputation of the ACC. Please keep me informed of ACC actions so I can pass it on to fellow rooftop friends.

Bottom line is we feel we were betrayed by SSVEC when they originally pushed rooftop installation. Personally, I would still make the same decision but now feel I was conned about the long term savings and return on the investment.

Thank you!

Dennis Ehrenberger
2783 Glenside Drive
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

edefiji@aol.com

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Nyles Courtney <ncourt@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, September 04, 2015 7:55 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: SSVEC solar rates

I have written to you previously about this proposed rate increase. I would like to urge you to ask certain members of the commission to recuse themselves on solar rate issues. There are members who received the bulk of their campaign monies from known Anti Solar organizations and businesses. Their voting would reflect a lack of integrity and fairness to us, the voters. If a rate increase can be purchased by large donations, then our system is corrupt.

Thank you
Nyles Courtney
2654 Meadowbrook Circle
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

Teresa Tenbrink

From: Jen Magoffin <jenc011340@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 10:11 AM
To: BitterSmith-Web
Subject: Utility Source LLC

To the ACC Commissioners:

Good Morning! I am writing in hopes that you will take our communities concerns with regards to the huge proposed water increase. The water increase would be detrimental for our community and my family. Our water bill is already significantly higher than the surrounding communities. I am afraid with the increase we will have to leave our wonderful community. With the cost of driving into town now the increase in our water Bellemont will no longer be affordable. I should not have to worry about watering my yard, cooking or even giving my daughter a bath. It's ridiculous. Please take into consideration that we will stay in Bellemont because it is affordable. Bellemont will become a ghost town if this goes through, people are already leaving and this will push people out even faster. Please take our concerns into consideration. Thanks Jennifer Magoffin

Sent from my iPhone